

0

REMARKS

The comments of the Examiner as set forth in the Office Paper mailed 3 September 2004 have been carefully studied and reviewed.

5 Claims 18-28 are pending in the application.
Claims 18-28 have been rejected.

The specification has been objected to.
The drawings have been objected to.

10

Amendments to the Specification

The amendment to the specification is to correct a typographical error noticed upon reviewing the specification, wherein "rosin" was inadvertently used instead of
15 ~~resin~~.

The basis for this amendment is the paragraph starting at p. 13. line 4, in which
"polymeric resins" are described.

No new matter has been added.

20 The other amendments to the specification are correct references to Tables,
described further in a following section.

Claims

25 Claims 18-28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101, as claiming the same
invention as that of Claims 18-28 of prior U.S. Patent Application Ser. No. 10/137,689.

30 Applicant submits that this double patenting rejection is improper. During a
telephonic interview with Examiner David Brunsman on 8 July 2004, Examiner
Brunsman stated he would, and subsequently did, withdraw the restriction requirement
as to Claims 18-28 (copy of Interview Summary attached as Exhibit A). Claims 18-28
were allowed, and Claims 1-17 and 29 were withdrawn from consideration because of
the new restriction requirement.

0 Claims of Group I (Claims 1-17 and 29) should be the pending Claims in this
divisional application.

 Claims 18-28 are hereby withdrawn from consideration, and are hereby
cancelled solely because they are the subject of U.S. Pat. No. 6,811,824 B2, issued 2
5 Nov. 2004 (based on the parent application, U.S. Patent Application Ser. No.
10/137,689).

 Applicant respectfully submits that this double patenting rejection has been
overcome, and requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

10 Claim 1 has been amended to correct the spelling of "crambe", which was
misspelled in the claims as cranbe.

 Crambe (Crambe abyssinica) is a recently exploited oilseed crop that can serve
15 as a feedstock for hydrogenation. Attached hereto is an article by S. Knight, entitled
"Crambe: A North Dakotan case study" published in the Proceedings of the 11th
Australian Agronomy Conference, Geelong 2003, and available on the Internet at
www.regional.org.au/au/asa/2003/c/11/knights.htm, describing crambe.

20 No new matter has been added.

 Claims 2-4, 6-7, 16-17 and 29 have been amended to clarify the claim language,
replacing the term "between approximately" with –from about– or –about–, as
appropriate.

25 Claims 13 and 14 have been amended based on the objections thereto in the
Office Paper No. 20040123 received in the parent application, U.S. Ser. No. 10/137,689,
prior to the reversal of the restriction requirement in that case. The Examiner (on p. 3 of
that Office Paper) stated that Claims 13 and 14 would be allowable if rewritten in
30 independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim, Claim 12 (which
depended from Claim 1). Accordingly, Claim 12 has been cancelled without prejudice.

Specification

 The disclosure was objected to because of an informality, in that the four pages of

0 Tables 1-4 that have been labeled as an appendix to the specification should be incorporated into the text of the specification.

The Examiner indicated a Table on p. 15 was not numbered, and the Examiner was uncertain where it fell within the other Tables.

5 The Tables have been incorporated into the text of the specification as requested. The shading on Tables 1-2 has been removed. The Table on p. 15 has been designated as Table 3, and a caption added based on the description of that Example. Tables originally labeled as Tables 3-4 have been renumbered as Tables 4-5,
10 respectively.

The amendments to the specification are to correct the numbering of the Tables; to facilitate review of this application a substitute specification is attached hereto. No new matter has been added.

15 **Drawings**


The drawings were objected to; a replacement sheet with the corrected drawing is submitted herewith, and labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header, per 37 CFR
20 §§ 1.84©) and 1.121(d). No new matter has been added.

Conclusion

25 Applicant thanks the Examiner for the thoughtful review of this application, and respectfully requests the Examiner review the pending Claims and to find that they define patentable subject matter. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the present pending Claims be allowed.

30 In the event that this Amendment does not place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned in order that an attempt can be made to place the application in condition for allowance as expeditiously as possible.

0 Respectfully submitted,



THOMAS L. ADAMS

Attorney for Applicant

Reg. No. 27,300

5 DATED: December 3, 2004

10 Thomas L. Adams
Attorney-At-Law
120 Eagle Rock Avenue
P.O. Box 340
East Hanover, New Jersey 07936
Tel:(973)-463-0100
15 Fax:(973)-463-0150